



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

slipshod, colloquial manner of expression he uses for this introductory material, and avoids almost entirely thereafter. The good people who argue for doctoral dissertations that are more readable are likely to have particularly high ideals of literary style; so that these chapters, in their present form, can expect little justification anywhere. "A bullet-proof definition"; "running up long bills"; "all the go at court"; "to show up the ridiculousness of affectation," are rather characteristic expressions early in the book; while many of the sentences offend against the simplest principles of composition. The body of the dissertation seems to acquire dignity of expression with its increased thoroughness of treatment.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

A. H. UPHAM.

---

*THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE*, Volumes V and VI, *The Drama to 1642*, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons.

The two volumes of *The Cambridge History of English Literature* covering the drama to 1642 are virtually a complete work in themselves. As such they are in most respects pleasingly organized. The fifth volume gives a survey of the early religious drama, traces the growth of the drama in the sixteenth century to Shakespeare,—to whom rightly much space is given,—and closes with a study of the minor dramatists at the end of the century and with a survey of the social movements that helped to shape the drama. The second volume happily begins with Jonson, the dominant literary figure of the Jacobean age, and traces the history of the drama in Jonson's great contemporaries to its close in a school of minor writers. At the end of the sixth volume five chapters deal with certain corollaries of the great public drama. As a whole, the work is extremely valuable, and a number of chapters represent, in their respective lines, the best that has been done in so small a compass. In general, breadth and fulness of treatment, firmness of structure, suggestiveness and freshness of statement, and convincing analysis of literary qualities are found here at their best in the men who have contributed most to the scientific study of the drama. In many of these chapters, all the phases of the subject that ought to find treatment in a study destined to serve in large measure for reference are represented: the lives and works of the dramatists, the relation of individual writers or groups to other writers or groups, whether through movements or sources, and a clear estimate of general literary qualities and peculiarities of art in the writers studied. As might be expected, however, where there

are so many contributors, conflicting ideals and inequality of work are apparent. A few of the contributors restrict themselves too largely to a literary appreciation of the dramatists in question, and do not give the historical material that students will desire, so that certain chapters are valuable chiefly as essays and not as the history of literature. In fact, the weakness of the series of volumes in *The Cambridge History* seems to me to lie in a failure to hold the various contributors to some definite ideal that might give greater unity of purpose.

From the nature of the work, it will be necessary to take up the chapters one by one. The first and the last chapter of Vol. V, by Prof. Ward, deal with phases of social life that influenced the drama, and form a framework for the volume. Such surveys can be exceedingly illuminating. The final chapter seems to me important, giving an impression of the age that the same material distributed through the various chapters as illustrative comment could not give, though it is hardly to be expected that in so small a compass the multitudinous phases of social life in the Elizabethan era could be adequately treated. The first chapter, on the other hand, seems to me unnecessary. The total space given to the early drama is rather small, and Prof. Ward's chapter duplicates too much that is to be found immediately in Mr. Child's account of the secular drama and in Prof. Creizenach's account of the religious drama, chapters which are in themselves merely short surveys of movements. The names of Professors Creizenach, Cunliffe, and Boas promise excellence in the respective chapters on the early religious drama, early English tragedy, and early English comedy. Many details and phases of literary development are excellently fused here. Prof. Manly's treatment of the Children of the Chapel in Vol. VI furnishes important supplementary matter for these chapters. The introduction to Bond's recent *Early Plays from the Italian* and a paper by Mr. T. S. Graves in the April number of *Modern Philology*, furnishing new material on the political drama, will enlarge our knowledge of the field covered in Prof. Boas's chapter.

The chapter on the University Wits by Prof. Baker is excellent in material, with succinct and telling critical estimates, but it is too brief. For Greene there is perhaps a better historical account than literary estimate. In the case of Lyly, however, Prof. Baker seems to have felt that his past endeavors entitled him to be silent about the main historical details. Few facts of Lyly's life are given, the plays are mentioned only incidentally, and there is no grouping of the plays or indication of the various types of work they represent. The treatment

of Lyly's connection with the past also lacks definiteness, though his position as an adapter is justly emphasized. More might be said, too, of Lyly's influence on other men than Shakespeare, on Jonson, for example, whose relation to Lyly I have stressed elsewhere. On the whole, one feels that Prof. Baker has made one of the most important transitional figures in dramatic literature the subject of a short generalizing essay. Yet so excellent is the analysis that we are prone to forgive the inadequacy of the historical treatment. It is pleasing, too, to find Prof. Baker accepting as possible Lyly's authorship of the songs in his plays, but the case for Lyly still needs strengthening. Prof. Baker's account of Peele, also, is rather brief, lacking a discussion of the order of plays, etc., but it is better rounded than the treatment of Lyly and yet equally valuable in its critical estimate. In regard to the statement that Nashe was lodged in the Fleet for his part in *The Isle of Dogs*, I may refer to Mr. McKerrow's argument on the absence of any evidence of imprisonment.

In Prof. Gregory Smith's chapter on Marlowe and Kyd, which supplements the preceding chapter in dealing with the immediate predecessors of Shakespeare, the aim, happily, is to give Marlowe a rank as a literary man without reference to the usual treatment of him as a forerunner of Shakespeare. The result is a critical essay primarily, but an excellent one. Besides, a good account is given of the established facts in Marlowe's life—except his summons before the Privy Council—and of the work which there is any substantial evidence for assigning to him. On the other hand, the treatment of Marlowe is characterized by a minimum discussion of mooted questions and by a disregard of sources and literary relations. Prof. Saintsbury, however, in his chapter on Shakespeare's plays discusses the influence of Marlowe on Shakespeare. In treating Kyd, Prof. Smith is far less rigid in his exclusion of mooted matters, for he, perhaps justifiably, accepts as referring to Kyd all of the points in Nashe's famous attack, a view which McKerrow is the latest critic to discredit.

Prof. Saintsbury's chapter on Shakespeare's plays, the most important section of the work, is by no means the most satisfactory. It has excellent points, and shows the usual flashes of good sense to be found in Prof. Saintsbury's work; but it also shows the usual prejudice and perversity of that extremely individualistic Briton. His conservative attitude in dealing with some problems, his disposition to reject theorizing and conjecture, is pleasing; the greatest shortcoming of the chapter, however, is his consequent rejection of some of the little evidence that really exists. In the first place, having once begun to point out the weakness of guessing as a method of

Shakespeare study, he stresses his position through many a sentence that could well be spared in an essay of so limited scope, for the point is obvious—in spite of the individual critic's confidence in his own views—and after all we should like to have summarized for us many of the guesses, neglected by Prof. Saintsbury, which represent the combined study of many critics. In the second place, the rejection of so much seems merely to clear the ground for Prof. Saintsbury's own theorizing, which in a number of cases does not impress one so strongly as views that have more evidence in their favor, circumstantial though it may be. In fact, much of the valuable evidence of other scholars, especially that gathered of late years, Prof. Saintsbury apparently does not know.

In the matter of the order of Shakespeare's plays, the crux and at the same time the great achievement of the historical treatment of Shakespeare, Prof. Saintsbury's study is very unsatisfactory. Rejecting the usual efforts at a chronology of the plays, he makes Meres and the First Folio the basis of his attempt to establish the order. The valuable supplementary evidence of references to individual plays, parodies, quotations, etc. he disregards in the main. The result is that he substitutes his own impressions as tests, flounders and hesitates in his conclusions, and finally departs radically from his basis in Meres and the Folio. Outside of the confusion which arises from this method, there are what will appeal to many as positive errors in order and dates. The treatment of *Measure for Measure*, ca. 1604, as probably based on an earlier draft has, to my mind, little to defend it. The play is apparently steeped through and through with the spirit of the satirical school at the opening of the seventeenth century, which probably had most to do with the change of tone in Shakespeare's work. In the light of the same influence, I see no reason to accept Prof. Saintsbury's theory that *Troilus and Cressida* was written much earlier than 1602-3. The play seems to be best explained by reference to the manner of the railing satirists popular as the century opened. *Henry V* is treated after the great comedies that belong around 1600, and is thus separated from the group of chronicle plays to which it forms a culmination. The extreme example of Prof. Saintsbury's method is found in the case of *Julius Caesar*. He groups the play with *Coriolanus* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, regarding the three as having been written about the same time and after the close of the sixteenth century. He apparently accepts the view that *Julius Caesar* should be assigned to 1601 because of a supposed reference to the play in that year, and is seemingly unaware of all the evidence for the year 1599 which has recently been so much exploited. There

could hardly be a stronger case for a date. Weever's *Mirror for Martyrs*, in which occurs the reference in 1601 alluded to, was declared to have been finished two years earlier. The passage in *Julius Caesar*, "O judgment, thou art fled to brutish beasts," is parodied in *Every Man out of his Humour*, 1599, and in *Doctor Dodipoll*, published in 1600. At the end of *All Fools*, originally produced in 1599, there is possibly a humorous burlesque of Antony's speech over Brutus, "This was a man"; and Carlo's "Et tu, Brute," to his ally Macilente, who turns against him (*Every Man out*, V, 4), seems to burlesque Caesar's words as he realizes that he is betrayed by his friend Brutus. Possible echoes of Shakespeare's play have been found in *A Warning for Fair Women*, 1599, *Old Fortunatus*, 1599, and *The Blind Beggar of Bednal Green*, 1600. Besides, Platter saw a *Julius Caesar* in London, probably at the Globe, in September, 1599 (*Anglia*, XXII, 458). If we make reasonable allowance for the possibility that there was another *Julius Caesar* about 1599; that some of the similar phrasing in the plays mentioned was conventional; and that Shakespeare may have been the borrower in some cases, the evidence still seems too strong to assign *Julius Caesar* to any other date than 1599. Besides, the presence of the cobbler in the opening scene of the play and the faint sketch of the conventional malcontent in Casca are among the popular motives found in *Julius Caesar* that would best fit 1599.

There can hardly be any defence for ignoring the evidence in regard to the date of this play, but Prof. Saintsbury would probably repudiate the suggestion that Shakespeare's work should be viewed more in the light of his age. Yet the failure to relate the individual plays to the popular conventions and motives of the day is one of the weaknesses of the chapter. There is no reference here, for example, to the revenge and malcontent motives in *Hamlet*. To return to *Julius Caesar* as an illustration, Prof. Saintsbury's declaration that Antony's speech is "all Shakespeare's own" is only relatively true. The mob and its veering were among the established conventions of Elizabethan literature, and had probably already been treated by Shakespeare in *Henry VI*. Antony's speech, with its adaptation to the mob, seems to owe a great deal to More's address to the mob in *Sir Thomas More*. The two are very similar in dramatic handling, in tone, and in certain ideas and expressions. The contrast between the euphuistic or rhetorical quality of Brutus's speech<sup>1</sup> and the plainness of Antony's effective oration represents a critical

<sup>1</sup> The speech of Diogenes to the mob in *Campaspe* is interesting in connection with this aspect of Brutus's speech and with Coriolanus's attitude to the mob.

interest of the age. Sidney in his *Apology* uses as an illustration the orator Antonius, who "pretended not to know Arte" that "with a playne sensiblenes" he "might win credit of popular eares; which credit is the neerest step to perswasion" (G. Smith, *Eliz. Crit. Essays*, I, 203). Again, it must have been since Prof. Saintsbury wrote his chapter that MacCallum's *Shakespeare's Roman Plays* and the article by Prof. Ayres in *Modern Language Publications* (June, 1910) have emphasized the fact that the characterization of Caesar and the dramatic nemesis in his downfall follow a sixteenth century Senecan tradition.

Not all such details, of course, could be expected in a study like Prof. Saintsbury's, but it seems desirable at least to give the point of view. Many details are omitted, however, without justification, it seems to me. Some of these are supplied at the end of the chapter in the appendix giving dates and sources, but even here there is not enough. Caxton's *Recuyell* is omitted from the sources of *Troilus and Cressida*, I note. The statement that *Leir* was written in 1605 is in all probability an error. Prof. Saintsbury's chapter on the poems of Shakespeare is much more pleasing. Chapters on "The Text of Shakespeare" and "Shakespeare on the Continent," by Ernest Walder and J. G. Robertson, are valuable supplements to the Shakespeare material.

The remaining chapters of the fifth volume (X and XIII) represent the inferior drama. Mr. Moorman deals with the pseudo-Shakespearian plays and Mr. Bayne with the lesser Elizabethan dramatists. The number of anonymous and joint plays and our limited knowledge of the work of many dramatists furnish ground for much variation of opinion in the field. Mr. Moorman's discussion of *Locrine* may be taken as an illustration. He would ascribe the play to Kyd, and supports his claim with a number of parallels between *Locrine* and *The Spanish Tragedy*. By referring to *Solimon and Perseda* he might have added to the list of parallels between *Locrine* and Kyd's work the fooleries of Strumbo and Piston on the battlefield,—forerunners of Falstaff,—some common romantic details, the burlesque love affairs, etc. The case for Kyd, indeed, seems to me stronger than that for Greene or Marlowe. But most of the evidence for ascription to one dramatist or another is based on conventions. The tone of the play does not seem to me to fit Kyd, and it is probable that Peele is still the best guess. Mr. Moorman's theory that *Locrine* was written before 1590 and that the portions taken from Spenser were added in 1595 when the play was revised is unfortunate in view of the fact that Prof. Cunliffe in an earlier chapter of *The Cambridge History* gives pretty con-

clusive evidence that *Selimus*, printed in 1594, borrowed from a version of *Locrine* that contained the Spenserian passages. The initials W. S. attached to *Locrine* were, according to Mr. Moorman, probably "intended to convey the impression of Shakespearian authorship." As the title page reads, they may refer to author or reviser. If they were intended for Shakespeare, he must have had a small part in the revision of the comic scenes and in the finer passages of poetry, for it is not probable that as early as 1595 his mere initials would have been used to sell the work. It seems to me not improbable that the initials represent the name of the author or of some one other than Shakespeare as reviser. Mr. Moorman's arguments for ascribing *The Birth of Merlin* to Rowley and Dekker, and parts of *Edward III* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* to Shakespeare are interesting and skillfully handled as a matter of personal impression, but needless to say, they are not conclusive. In speaking of the play *Sir Thomas More* Mr. Moorman, on the authority of Dyce, cites as a source Cresacre More's life of More, written as late at least as the second decade of the seventeenth century. Dyce does quote the cutpurse incident from Cresacre More, but the dramatist, who, as Mr. Moorman points out, seems to have known Latin, very probably got the anecdote from Stapleton's *Tres Thomae*, 1588, a source neglected by Dyce. There is an error, also, in the statement that Mr. Tucker Brooke ascribes *The Puritan* to Middleton; he is inclined to see Marston's hand in the play. Mr. Moorman's work, however, is good. He is really conservative considering his material, knows his plays and the field as well, and shows critical insight.

In the group of minor dramatists treated by Mr. Bayne there is room for boundless conjecture, and he is free enough with it. With rather meager facts, some guesses of other students, and a broad reliance on impressions received from reading, he establishes fixed categories and builds up literary individualities, for Munday, Chettle, and Haughton especially. Among other things he attempts to determine rather definitely the parts of Chettle and Munday in their joint plays, and he follows Fleay and Greg in dispossessing Yarrington of *The Two Lamentable Tragedies* and distributing it to several dramatists—with no notice of R. A. Law's strong argument for Yarrington and unity of authorship. The chapter is interesting enough; but, valuable as such work is in the drama, here it seems to be overdone. Some correction, also, is needed in the chapter. Wentworth Smith is given as the author of *The Hector of Germany*, though the title page of the play has only W. Smith. Much of the discussion of Munday is based on the assumption that *The Two Italian Gentle-*



men is his; in the *Collections* of the Malone Society, however, a claim has recently been made for Chapman's authorship. The statement that the play is lost has been corrected in the bibliography, and here the source, Pasqualigo's *Il Fedele*, is also given.

The treatment of Jonson by Prof. Thorndike, which opens Vol. VI, is a strong one. The author has harmonized the life and work of Jonson, justly stressing the influence of Jonson's ideals and critical theories on his attitude to Shakespeare and to his opponents in the stage-quarrel, without overemphasizing the attacks on individual in the plays; he has pointed out the value for Jonson of the realism in the older drama and satire, at the same time giving due weight to his early connection with romanticism; and he has given a good statement of Jonson's position as a forerunner of Restoration classicism. Along with this goes a correct and succinct account of the life and work of the dramatist. A more definite analysis of the idea of humours would not have been out of place, and my own studies in Jonson have naturally made me feel that more stress should have been laid on his method of using literary material, shown wherever he has left notes for his work. Some account is taken in footnotes of sources suggested for the plays, where the strength of the claim seemed to warrant it; but Jonson's habit of building up literary mosaics appears to me more important, and his borrowings from English literature for these mosaics are extensive in spite of the fundamental classicism which Prof. Thorndike rightly claims for him. Indeed, in such a play as *Every Man out of his Humour* the classic element seems to me of minor importance. Prof. Thorndike recognizes the English tone of Jonson's work, but he perhaps does not take sufficiently into account the influence of English literature. To the details of Jonson's life ought to be added the interesting evidence for his part as joint author with Nashe of *The Isle of Dogs*. It possibly helps to elucidate the letters written when Jonson was imprisoned for his part in *Eastward Hoe*, and may have a bearing on the stage-quarrel.

The chapter by Prof. Dixon on Jonson's fellows, Chapman, Marston, and Dekker, rounds out the group of early reformers of the drama, and gives identifications of characters and other details in the plays concerned with the stage-quarrel. While Prof. Dixon goes to no extremes in his identifications, he is none too conservative. By way of specific objections, it hardly seems worth while to note the old identification of Torquatus as Jonson in Marston's satire in view of Hart's convincing evidence that the character represents Harvey; the suggested identification of Amorphus in *Cynthia's Revels* with Munday

seems to me forced; and the impression should not be left that the characterization of Chrisogonus in *Histrionomastix* is necessarily an attack on the individual portrayed, for many scholars regard the portrayal as intended for a compliment to Jonson. Amid much that is fairly rounded and modern, some details in the treatment of the lives and works of the dramatists are inexact or represent views no longer current. The emphasis on the relatively late period of life at which Chapman became connected with the drama is certainly unfortunate if *The Two Italian Gentlemen* is his, and is hardly warranted by Meres's statements in regard to him. Again, most modern students of Chapman, Prof. Parrott, for example, would scarcely uphold the statement that for a period of four or five years at the beginning of the seventeenth century Chapman produced nothing for the stage.

The chapter by Mr. Symons dealing with Middleton and Rowley is an excellent literary estimate, though a far higher value is put upon the work of Rowley than many students would accept, and probably an exaggerated claim is made for his share in his joint work with Middleton. Little attention is given to Middleton's sources or to the relation of his work to that of such men as Shakespeare and Jonson. Indeed, there is no list or connected account of his plays. The chapter on Heywood by Prof. Ward is much better rounded. Here the domestic play, an important minor type of the drama, is discussed. The chapter on Beaumont and Fletcher by Prof. Macaulay and that on Massinger by Prof. Koepfel seem to me among the best in the two volumes. In them we find a full command of the subject, adequate accounts of the dramatists' lives and works, excellent analyses of literary qualities, and a treatment of sources, of connection with other literature and with the age, and of verse and plotting. The next chapter, on Tourneur and Webster, scarcely falls behind these two, but Prof. Neilson's chapter on Ford and Shirley, though good, is not so impressive, partly because his discussion of Shirley, like earlier treatments of this dramatist, fails to present adequately the various aspects of his literary personality and to help us to a definite enough sense of what Shirley's work stands for. In the final chapter on the regular drama, the lesser dramatists of the seventeenth century are treated by Mr. Bayne, who also deals with the lesser dramatists of the Elizabethan period. Here he appears to much better advantage, since the problems are less matters of conjecture and his deductions from literary interpretation find a firmer basis. Perhaps his analysis of Day is the most effective. It is hardly necessary to say that in a short chapter dealing with such a vast amount of material one can point to omissions. The

lyric in Brome's *Queen and Concubine*, "What if a day, or a month, or a year," which is praised as having the "true Elizabethan charm of Campion or Dekker," was an old and familiar song when Brome used it, and was for a long time ascribed to Campion (*Mod. Philology*, IV, 397 ff. and V, 383 ff.).

The remaining chapters of the volume are concerned with certain general phases of dramatic work and conditions. "The Elizabethan Theatre," by Prof. Child, is a comprehensive survey of companies, playhouses, staging, audience, and actors. His discussion of staging furnishes the fullest scope for disagreement. A number of questions might be raised—concerning the matter of how far inns influenced the public stage, the date of the Children at Blackfriars, the use of painted scenery on the stage, etc. A recent article by Mr. Graves (*Mod. Philology*, January, 1912) shows the incorrectness of Prof. Child's statement in regard to the performance of *England's Joy*, and adds information about hangings and curtains at the Swan. Prof. Manly's excellent chapter on the Children of the Chapel unfortunately ends with Elizabeth's reign. The chapter by Prof. Boas on the University Plays is an excellent study of an interesting phase of dramatic activity, and very valuable indeed for its enlargement of our view of that activity. Of exceptional interest are the discussion of *Perfidus Hetruscus* in relation to *Hamlet*, and the interpretation of the treatment of Shakespeare in *The Return from Parnassus*, Part II, as bitterly ironical. The text and the bibliography of the chapter need to be supplemented by the material furnished recently in Miss Morgan's article "The Latin University Drama" (*Jahrbuch der Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, XLVII, 69 ff.). The chapter on the masque and the pastoral by Mr. Bayne includes a pleasing estimate of the masterpieces in the two fields, and a brief history of the two types, which had already been worked out unusually well. Jonson is naturally the central figure of this chapter. The enthusiastic praise accorded his *Masque of Christmas* is perhaps just, but Mr. Bayne apparently does not understand that much of its charm and its excellence as a picture of English life is due to its nature as a folk play. The relation of this masque to the sword-dancers' songs and the mummers' plays, as well as to *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, has been pointed out by me in *Modern Philology* (Oct., 1908). Mr. Child in his discussion of the folk drama in Vol. V does not refer to this masque of Jonson's. The chapter by Mr. Wilson on the Puritan attack fitly closes the volumes in which a record is made of the dramatic activity brought to a close by the Puritan forces that opposed it.

One of the important features of *The Cambridge History* is the plan of a separate bibliography for each chapter. The bibliographies in the volumes before me are on the whole disappointing, though many are apparently very good. While some of the contributors list all of the plays in the field rather carefully, and some give fairly full lists of works bearing on their field, others fall short in one or both respects. If the bibliographers had been handled uniformly well, the omission of plays, theories, etc. from the chapters themselves, made necessary by the limited scope of the work, might have been offset, and material might have been furnished for a full study of each field. It is rather hazardous to criticize a select bibliography, but I shall call attention to some of the important omissions that I have noted. No thorough test has been attempted of the reliability of the details given in the bibliographies or in the chapters themselves.

Omissions from the lists of plays are perhaps rarest. In both volumes, however, many of the writers pay little attention to the matter of lost plays. All of these of which we have any record ought to be listed in the bibliographies or in footnotes. This would seem especially feasible as well as valuable for the Henslowe group of writers. But the bibliography of the chapter on the lesser Elizabethan dramatists, of whom the Henslowe writers form the nucleus, does not even list all the extant dramas that belong to the field. Some of the extant plays omitted are *Coblers Prophecie*, *Pedlers Prophecie*, *Knack to Know an Honest Man*, *Stukeley*, and *Fair Maid of Bristow*. *The Hector of Germany*, reprinted by L. W. Payne, *Sir John Oldcastle*, *Histriomastix*, and *Jack Drum*—all discussed in the text—are apparently not included in any of the bibliographies; and *Two Wise Men and All the Rest Fools* and *Second Maiden's Tragedy*, which we might expect to find referred to under Chapman, seem likewise to have been omitted altogether. Frequently plays omitted where we would most expect to find them are included elsewhere without cross references. It is not surprising that certain editions or reprints are disregarded, but such omissions mar the bibliographies for practical purposes. For the chapter on Jonson the 1716 edition of his works and Hart's two volumes of his plays (part of an incomplete edition important on account of the introduction) should be listed. The reprints of Daborne's two plays in *Anglia*, XX and XXI, ought to be noted for the chapter on the minor seventeenth century dramatists. In the bibliography of the same chapter it is not made clear that *Every Woman in her Humour* is reprinted in Bullen's *Old Plays*. I have noted nearly a score more of such cases.

In the matter of critical material omissions can naturally be pointed out for most of the chapters, but in many cases these may be deliberate. Some very important works, however, are lacking. I shall mention only a few of them. Meyer's *Machiavelli* ought to be found in the Marlowe bibliography or in that of the chapter on early tragedy. Under Kyd or under *Hamlet*, should be given, as it seems to me, the more important articles dealing with the old *Hamlet*, especially those treating its relation to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The literature of the Hamlet saga is partly filled in on pp. 503 f. and 519 of Vol. V, but there are no cross references. Articles by Thorndike on *Hamlet* and the revenge plays (*Mod. Lang. Pub.*, March, 1902) and by Stoll on the malcontent (*Mod. Phil.*, Jan., 1906), as well as Lewis's *Genesis of Hamlet* and Werder's *Vorlesungen über Hamlet*, are important enough to deserve a place in the bibliography. In fact, though the general bibliography on the Shakespeare chapters seems good, the part dealing with separate plays is decidedly faulty. Apparently there is no principle of inclusion or exclusion here. In Vol. VI, Aronstein's *Ben Jonson* should appear in the Jonson bibliography. The bibliography of Chapter II has many omissions. Thus half a dozen articles dealing with Chapman are omitted, some of which, at least, deserve attention—Stiefel's "George Chapman und das italienische Drama," for example (*Jahrbuch der Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, XXXV). Crawford's *Collectanea*, also omitted here, is valuable for both Chapman and Marston. Few critical works are given for Middleton. Certainly Christ's *Quellen-studien zu den Dramen Thomas Middleton's* ought to be listed here, as well as some of the bibliographical items given in Morris's volume on Middleton and Rowley in the Belles-Lettres Series. Sampson's volume on Webster in the same series likewise takes account of some works that should not have been omitted from the Webster bibliography. Under Heywood, again, there is little critical material, Prof. Kittredge's treatment of the sources of *The Captives*, for example, being omitted. The bibliography of the chapter on "The Lesser Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists" is especially lacking in critical material. Typical of its weakness is the statement under *Sir Giles Goosecappe*, "Bulden and Fleay suggest that it contains early work of Chapman," while the important articles of Parrott (*Mod. Philology*, July, 1906) and Kittredge (*Jour. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, II, 10 ff.) are not mentioned. The bibliography for "The English Theatre" is fairly full, but G. F. Reynolds (*Mod. Philology*, July, 1911) mentions more than a score of monographs and articles of recent years not found in the section here on "Construction and Staging." Disregarding those published

since the chapter went to press, we still find some important items lacking. The bibliography for "The Puritan Attack upon the Stage" seems excellent, but I note the omission of Crosse's *Virtue's Commonwealth*.

Most of us have learned to be charitable in regard to typographical errors, but it must be said that a surprising number have escaped the proofreaders in these two volumes. The list of *errata* corrected for the fifth volume is a large one, and yet in the two volumes I have noted at least forty others. Errors are especially numerous in the bibliographies, where misspelled proper names and incorrect initials are frequent. It may be worth while to note some misprinted dates. Vol. V, p. 114, l. 33, 1638 should read 1538; p. 348, n. 1, 1560 should read 1580, the date of *The Third Blast of Retreat from Plays and Theatres*; p. 528, l. 27, 1809 should read 1909; Vol. VI, p. 317, l. 15, 485 should read 1485; p. 331, l. 19, 1582 should read 1482; p. 356, l. 38, 1506 should read 1605; p. 442, l. 14, 1528 should read 1582, the date of Gosson's *Playes confuted in five Actions*. The following examples of errors in titles and proper names may be noted: Vol. V, p. 425 (under Collier), *The Three Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, and p. 552, *Rare Thoughts of Love and Fortune*, should read *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*; p. 434 (under C) *Dux Morand* should read *Dux Moraud*; p. 447, l. 31, Gandina should read Caudina according to Prof. Cunliffe's reprint in *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, March, 1911; Vol. VI, p. 35, l. 18, *Ovid's Banquet of Sauce* should read *Ovid's Banquet of Sense*; p. 279, l. 18, Nowell should read Knowell.

*The University of Chicago.*

C. R. BASKERVILL.

---

*STUDIER I BEOWULFSAGAN*.....af Henrik Schück,  
Upsala, 1909.

In this monograph Professor Henrik Schück of the University of Upsala presents the theory that the *Beowulf* was composed in Friesland by an English traveller, whose literary materials comprised two saga cycles, the one consisting of Danish stories told by Danes, the other, of Geatish stories told by Geats. Professor Schück also makes the conjecture that the name Beowulf resulted from a combination of the names of two heroes, Beow and Wulf.

Schück's argument is based on an examination of the figure of the hero, the fundamental motifs, and the episodes and allusions in the poem. The disparity in age between the young warrior of the Grendel exploit and the venerable king of the dragon fight leads him to assume that the Beowulf-